

REMARKS

Amendment summary

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-25 will be pending.

Claims 1, 22, and 23 are amended to clarify that the jacket-molding of the capacitor element excludes only a part or the whole of the respective bottom faces or bottom and side faces of the anode in cathode terminals. Support for this amendment is found, e.g., in Figure 1 of the present specification.

Claims 1, 22, and 23 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which is canceled.

Claims 22 and 23 are amended to clarify the methods therein. Support for these amendments is found, e.g., from page 19, line 22 to page 21, line 6 of the specification.

No new matter is added by this Amendment, and Applicant respectfully submits that entry of this Amendment is proper.

Status of the claims

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-7, 10, 13-15, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Maeda (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0163775). In addition, claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Naito (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0002526). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Waldenburger (DE 2509856).

Additionally, claims 1, 3, 5, 7-8, 10, 13-18 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 2003-133177 (hereinafter "JP '177"). Finally, claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '177 in view of Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,219,223) (hereinafter "Kobayashi").

Response to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite because the language therein was allegedly confusing. Applicants respectfully note that claims 22-23 have been amended, and as such are not confusing.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 22-23 renders the § 112 rejection moot, and respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

Response to claim rejections based on Maeda

Applicant respectfully submits that Maeda, even when combined with the other cited references, does not anticipate or render obvious the presciently claimed invention. Specifically, Maeda is distinct from the presently claimed invention because it discloses a capacitor in which elements other than a part or whole of the respective bottom faces or bottom and side faces of the anode and cathode terminals are not jacket-molded.

Independent claim 1 as amended recites a chip solid electrolyte capacitor obtained by connecting a part of the anode part and a part of the cathode part of a capacitor element to an anode terminal and a cathode terminal, respectively, and jacket-molding the capacitor element excluding only a part or the whole of respective bottom faces or bottom and side faces of the anode and cathode terminals. The connection face of the cathode terminal to the capacitor

element is larger than the entire face of the capacitor element in the side connected to the cathode terminal, and the bottom face part of the cathode terminal and the bottom face part of the anode terminal have nearly the same size.

Applicant respectfully submits that Maeda's disclosure, specifically Figure 29, does not anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention because, as can be seen from Figure 29 in Maeda, surfaces other than the bottom faces or the bottom and side faces of the anode and cathode terminals are not jacket-molded in the capacitor disclosed in Maeda. Specifically, Applicant notes that a portion of the top surfaces of the cathode and anode (**41** and **42**, respectively, in Figure 29 in Maeda) are not encased by resin (jacket-molded), whereas the present claims recite that such surfaces are jacket-molded.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Maeda discloses (see, e.g., Figure 29) that an insulating substrate (**40** in Figure 29) is attached to the entire bottom surface of the cathode terminal. Because the bottom face of the cathode terminal does not directly connect to the outside circuit (rather, the capacitor in Figure 29 in Maeda directly connects to the outside circuit via surface **41B** or **41A**), the result from the capacitor in Maeda is an increased resistance and a higher ESR value.

Conversely, according to the structure of the present invention, the cathode and anode terminal may be connected to the outside circuit via a shorter path, resulting in a lower ESR value.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Maeda does not anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Naito nor Waldenburger cures the deficiencies of Maeda.

With respect to Naito, Applicant notes that Naito does not constitute prior art, and Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections based on Naito. Naito shares a common inventive entity with the present application, and is therefore not by another, and does not constitute prior art under either §102(a) or §102(e). Therefore, because Naito is also not prior art under §102(b), Applicant respectfully submits that Naito is not prior art against the claims of the present application.

With respect to Waldenburger, the Office Action cites Waldenburger for its disclosure of materials from which anode and cathode terminals may be constructed. Applicant respectfully submits that this teaching does not cure the deficiencies set forth in Maeda, above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Maeda, both alone and in conjunction with Naito or Waldenburger, does not anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 and §103 rejections based upon Maeda.

Response to rejections based on JP '177

Applicants respectfully notes that the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 22-23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections based on JP' 177, which did not encompass claim 2, have been rendered moot. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of these rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Abraham J. Rosner
Registration No. 33,276

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 30, 2007